

brated Five Sisters at York, in the North Transept, built between 1250 and 1260."

Now the windows of Becket's Crown are broad windows of pointed form,—certainly not much resembling a lancet in shape,—and by no means of that elegant and well-known proportion which is so universal in the Lancet Period, and which gave rise to the term.

But even if they had been of more advanced character than they really are, there would have been nothing remarkable in the fact that traces of a feature so characteristic of an entire Period as the one in question, should have made their appearance, at the close of the preceding Period, or that we should find here and there, in some of the latest Transitional Buildings, a dog-tooth moulding, a stiff-leaved capital, or a lancet window. The qualification, therefore, with which I undertook to discuss the proposition of "F. S. A.," referring to the progressive character of our National Architecture, is the best answer I can give to the argument which he proposes to found upon the admitted fact, that a window of pointed form was constructed in the east end of Canterbury Cathedral half a dozen years before the true commencement of the proposed Lancet Period.

Now, if "F. S. A." will apply precisely the same argument to the close of the Lancet Period that I have applied to its commencement, and make precisely the same allowance, in point of time, for the occasional occurrence of a Lancet window in the few first years of the Geometrical Period, he will no longer wonder to see, as in the north transept of Westminster Abbey, genuine lancet windows still occurring occasionally in the early part of the latter Period; and if, further, he will apply this same mode of reasoning to the whole of the Seven Periods in question, he will find that all his difficulties will disappear, and that sufficient margin will be given to cover those few apparent anachronisms which appear so much to disturb him, and which compelled Mr. Rickman, in his division of church architecture into four styles instead of seven, to make the periods of transition between two styles almost as broad as those of the styles themselves.

Now "F. S. A." asserts that the Five Sisters of York Cathedral were built A.D. 1250-1260, but in order to judge whether this is a speculative or a "well-authenticated date," I must again beg him to give us his authority, and the original text, *ipsisimis verbis*, from which he derives it. For although A.D. 1250 is only five years later than A.D. 1245, I am not disposed at present, and in the absence of such authority, to believe that this work, although of rich and advanced character, is of an late date as that ascribed to it by "F. S. A."

3. *Geometrical Period*, A.D. 1215-1315.—The whole of the remarks of "F. S. A." under this head are simply assertions exhibiting his anonymous opinion upon several points unsupported by a single "example" or a single "date." He has, however, made a reference here which I cannot pass over so lightly. After stating that this Period includes part of two of the established styles, the Early English and the Decorated, he proceeds, "The idea is not a new one: the same division and the same name for it was proposed by Mr. Freeman to the Oxford Architectural Society in 1842." Now if this be the case, and if the proposal went to the extent of separating and distinguishing, by a peculiar title, not merely the windows and tracery of this period, but the entire buildings themselves, their mouldings and details, and of identifying them by certain recognizable peculiarities of form and fashion, then undoubtedly Mr. Freeman anticipated by several years any publication, on my part, of similar views; but, whether his proposal went to this extent or not, it is very evident that Mr. Freeman's views and my own, and I think I may add those of two or three other architecturalists of no ordinary repute, have been running for some years past in singularly similar courses; and that, too, I believe, with little or no intercommunication. \* Of Mr. Freeman's recent valuable contributions to the stock of information

we are accumulating on this subject, and of the acuteness and industry which he brings to the task, it is impossible to speak too highly; and if "F. S. A." supposes that by the suggestion he throws out he may in any degree lessen the interest which each of us may take in the labours of the other, he grievously deceives himself.

6. *Curvilinear Tracery*, A.D. 1315-1360.—Here for the second time "F. S. A." brings forward facts. He instances a few buildings at the close of the Geometrical Period, in which there are windows containing Curvilinear Tracery; and argues accordingly, not only that Geometrical and Curvilinear Tracery are contemporaneous, but that such a fact is a fatal objection to the separation into two classes of Geometrical and Curvilinear buildings: similarly, I suppose, if he found a building in which, as is frequently the case, there occurred examples both of the chevron and the dog-tooth mouldings, he would declare the distinction between Norman and Early English buildings to be at an end. Wymington Church, to which he attaches the date A.D. 1270-1290, belongs to the latest part of the Curvilinear Period; that is to say, nearly a century later than "F. S. A." declares it to be. We want, therefore, his authority for this date.

7. *Rectilinear Period*, A.D. 1360-1550.—As neither "examples" nor "dates" illustrate his remarks, we will leave the few words which he devotes to this Period to carry what weight they may.

In conclusion, let us again refer to the proposition "F. S. A." pledged himself to prove: "Mr. Sharpe's divisions were not successive periods, but were frequently contemporaneous, as is easily proved by well-known examples and well-authenticated dates." Has he proved this? Has he attempted to do so as regards five out of the seven Periods? Has he not substituted unsupported assertions for the proofs which he declared he possessed? And, in the case of the two Periods in which he has brought forward examples and dates, has he, even supposing his dates to be correct, proved his proposition?

I leave the answer in the hands of your readers, and will conclude, for the present, by requesting him to supply us with the authorities on the strength of which he asserts the Five Sisters at York to have been built A.D. 1250-1260, and Wymington Church A.D. 1270-1290.

EDMUND SHARPE.

I HAVE to apologize to Mr. Freeman for the mistake I have inadvertently fallen into in attributing to him the first proposal of a "Geometrical Style." I was certainly under that impression; but the point is of very little moment. I merely wished to show that the idea was not a new one; that it had been proposed ten years ago and not adopted. Respecting Mr. Cox's letter I have only to observe, that I understand by a Period, a fixed space of time, and not an indefinite one, and that the term appears to me badly chosen, as calculated to mislead. Mr. Sharpe's theories are not supported by facts: he generalizes too rapidly from a few instances, and overlooks an equal number of instances which tell the opposite way. His theory respecting the use of the pointed arch is one of these cases: it is true in some instances and not in others, and the examples are about as numerous on one side as the other: for instance, in Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford, the arches of the nave are round, while those of the clerestory are pointed, being exactly the opposite of Mr. Sharpe's theory. This church was finished about 1180, and the pointed arch does not occur except in these clerestory windows, obviously the latest part of the building. The choir and its aisles, which are the earlier portions, are good Norman work, though late: the nave, with the vaults of the aisles and the clerestory windows, are Transitional. The nave of Ely Cathedral is another instance of late Norman work, within Mr. Sharpe's Transitional Period: the remains of the Infirmary Church, so long called the Saxon Church, probably belong to the same period. The chapter-house and gateway of Bristol also belong to this period, and are not of Transitional charac-

ter, though late Norman. I quite agree with Mr. Cox, that in one sense the whole history of architecture is one of continual change, and that the division into styles is arbitrary; but after such a division has been generally agreed upon for the last thirty years, and after its general accuracy has been examined and attested by a host of observers at least as learned, as careful, and as accurate, as Mr. Sharpe himself, it is rather unreasonable of that gentleman to assume his own individual observations to be superior to those of all others combined. If he were content to make his observations subservient to the general cause by adopting the received system, instead of endeavouring to upset it altogether, it would not only be more modest, but he would be more likely to receive thanks, and to have his labours properly appreciated. Mr. Cox says, that "in matters of system and principle we are agreed." I shall be glad to find it so, but, as far as I understand the matter, Mr. Sharpe refuses to adopt the received system of four great divisions (corresponding nearly to the four centuries), with subdivisions and transitions between each. He wishes to establish a new system of his own, with seven great divisions, which he calls periods. It is against this change of system that I protest, as these proposed new divisions are less marked, less true, than the old ones. The features which Mr. Sharpe chooses as characteristic of each successive "period" are not so in fact: the instances which do not apply are almost as numerous as those that do. The different varieties of windows on which Mr. Sharpe relies do not sufficiently mark successive periods: they are almost as often used simultaneously. Mr. Cox says that I lay "too absolute a stress upon the importance of dates;" but it appears to me that in a question of this kind everything depends upon dates: if I can show that Lancet windows, for instance, were commonly used both before and after Mr. Sharpe's "Lancet Period," such a division can only mislead, and we must have better ground than this before we agree to give up the received system, and adopt Mr. Sharpe's new one. In my last letter, in referring to Dugdale as my authority for the date of Ilfley Church, I of course meant only to refer your readers and Mr. Sharpe to the authority from which I had taken it; but the real authority is obviously the Kenilworth Register, as quoted by Dugdale. I have no access to the original register, and do not know whether it is still in existence or not.

Cambridge.

F. S. A.

#### THE ART-UNION OF LONDON COMPETITION STATUETTES.

MOST of our readers who have visited the Sculpture Court in the Great Exhibition have doubtless observed the octagon stand in the centre of the room, containing, in stages, the statuettes sent to the Art-Union of London, in reply to the offered premiums of 100*l.* and 50*l.* for the first and second best figure adapted for bronze. The council, desiring that the works should be exhibited to the public before adjudication, have only just now made their selection: they have awarded the first prize to "Satan punished in the moment of supposed triumph," found to be by Mr. H. H. Armistead; and the second to the statuette called "Solitude," found to be by Mr. John Lawlor. They have further pointed out for special commendation "Ephialtes chained" as a work of great merit, although not adapted to their wants: the author of this is Mr. F. H. Hunt.

DONCASTER WATER-WORKS.—The corporation have advertised for plans and estimates of water-works suitable to the locality; premium 100*l.* The source of supply, it appears, is confined to the river Dun, at or above the weir of the present water-wheel, and the works required are stated to be such as to insure a constant supply of filtered water, the altitude of service to be adequate to supply the top rooms of the highest houses in the most elevated part of the town, and to the project so much of the present system of works as to be adapted as is practicable.

\* Mr. Freeman's letter of last week had not appeared when this letter was written.—Ed.